


summarily concludes that the disclosure is insufficient under 35 U.S.C. §112 without any foundation for this opinion. The Office Action fails to set forth what information is necessary for this purpose. The fact remains that the system described can measure such a system and the rejection of Claims 29-34 is improper without some specific deficiency being identified in the rejection. Applicant requests further clarification of the basis for the rejection so that it might be addressed. We note that the Office Action fails to provide any citation in support of this contention. MPEP 2163.04 indicates that the rejection must present "evidence of reasons why persons skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant's disclosure a description of the invention...".

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (781) 861-6240.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Thomas O. Hoover
Registration No. 32,470
Telephone (781) 861-6240
Facsimile (781) 861-9540

Lexington, Massachusetts 02421-4799
Dated: January 10, 2000